



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,562	01/26/2001	William J. Curatolo	PC9674AJTJ	8513
28523	7590	03/26/2009	EXAMINER	
PFIZER INC.			FUBARA, BLESSING M	
PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EASTERN POINT ROAD			1618	
GROTON, CT 06340				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/26/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

-IPGSGro@pfizer.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief		Application No. 09/770,562	Applicant(s) CURATOLO ET AL.
		Examiner BLESSING M. FUBARA	Art Unit 1618
<p>–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –</p> <p>THE REPLY FILED <u>28 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</p> <p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p> <p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p> <p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p> <p>AMENDMENTS</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4,15,17,22,23,26,36,37,49-51 and 53-56.</u></p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>28-35 and 38.</u></p> <p>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p> <p>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached <i>Information Disclosure Statement(s)</i>. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> <p>/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618</p>			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: a) amendment to claim 1 requiring the solid dispersion to consist of sparingly water soluble drug and HPMCAS requires further consideration and search; b) the proposed consisting language in claim 1 excludes solvent which would be present since the drug is a dispersion; c) further, the proposed amendment also raises the issue of new matter because the examiner cannot find a composition in the original specification that consists of HPMCAS and sparingly water soluble drug and the applicant has not directed the examiner to sections of the original specification that describes a solid dispersion that consists of HPMCAS and sparingly water soluble drug; d) the original specification does not implicitly teach a solid dispersion that consists of HPMCAS and sparingly water soluble drug; e) therefore, the rejections of record remain. Applicant's arguments that the rejections should be withdrawn because neither Miyajima nor Kigoshi discloses or suggests process for making solid amorphous dispersion containing low solubility drug and HPMCAS and solvent is not persuasive because the proposed amendment is not entered. It is also noted that the proposed amendment excludes solvent as seen in lines 3-5 of claim 1.

Applicant argues that the rejection of 02/06/09 should not have been made final because the claims were not amended and that MPEP 609.04 (b) III.2 clearly states that it is inappropriate to make it final under such circumstances. The examiner disagrees because MPEP 609. 04 (b) III has to do with "INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FILED AFTER II. ABOVE BUT PRIOR TO PAYMENT OF ISSUE FEE (37 CFR 1.97 (d)), and does not have section III.2. Applicant filed the IDS after the office action of 5/2/08.

/BF/